UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,507	07/08/2005	Takushi Yoshida	P/1250-293	2987
	7590 01/24/201 FABER GERB & SOF	EXAMINER		
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			MACARTHUR, SYLVIA	
NEW YORK, NY 100368403			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1716	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/24/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,507	YOSHIDA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sylvia R. MacArthur	1716	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
<ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/2.</li> <li>2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This</li> <li>3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise.</li> </ul>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☑ Claim(s) 40-78 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) 51-56 and 68-78 is/a  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☑ Claim(s) 40-50 and 57-67 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	re withdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 08 July 2005 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary		
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/541,507 Page 2

Art Unit: 1716

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/22/2010 has been entered.

# **Response to Arguments**

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/22/20010 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection recited below.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 40-47 and 57-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashi et al (JP 2003-005826) and Katsui et al (US 6,772,045)

Art Unit: 1716

Takashi et al teaches a system and method for management wherein the apparatus comprises a network having a coupling (plant 2 is provided with a AGC 4 and LAN 9) between a substrate processing apparatus (processors M1-Mn) discharging solution onto a rotation substrate via spin chuck 40, a computer 7 comprises a collection part (data box, see abstract) wherein data such a temperature and humidity (both of which are interpreted as the control elements) are monitored (via sensor 44) and collected, see also [0036 and 0037] wherein other control elements (such as rotation speed) are recited. The term non-conformity and automated diagnosis program found through the prior art is interpreted as the abnormality see also the claims section. Note humidity is interpreted as a measure of concentration. Takahashi teaches that an abnormality is detected based of data from temperature or humidity. Takahashi et al fails to teach the combined effect of temperature and humidity will signal an abnormality in the overall process.

Katsui et al teaches a system for determining dry cleaning timing (a process control element) based on the combination of the processing parameters (process control elements) data to determine the status of the process. The prior art of Katsui shows that it is well known technology to analyze the totality of the data to determine the status of the process and the severity of the abnormality(that is the difference between the actual measured process control element and the reference of expected value) In col. 5 lines 20-33, col. 6 24-33. col. 6 lines 43-col. 7 line 45. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to use the prior art of Katsui et al suggest using the combined effect of the data collected in the method of Takahashi et al.

Art Unit: 1716

The discussion of the supply pipe in [0027] in Takahashi et al reads on the discharge step.

Note the specific liquid discharged is a matter of an intended use as the nozzles and supply pipes of the prior art are inherently capable of supplying pure water and/or HF and perform cleaning. Furthermore, the type of fluid and process performed does not structurally limit the supply apparatus as claimed. Note also that the sequential order of the processing steps do not further limit the structure of the apparatus as all are controlled by the process controllers (1st, 2nd control sections, and computer) and are inherently capable of performing the steps in the order claimed.

5. Claims 48-50 and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashi et al (JP 2003-005826) in view Katsui et al as applied in claims 40-47 and 57-64 above in further view of Konishi et al (US 6,145,519).

The teachings of Takashi et al. as modified by Katsui et al were discussed above. The modification fails to teach a circulation mechanism. Konishi et al teaches a substrate processing unit wherein a substrate is cleaned. Konishi et al teaches a recovery unit to recycle/circulate the treatment solution. Konishi et al teaches both HF and water as treatment fluids see col. 8 line 58 and the abstract. The motivation to provide a circulation system is that recycling/recovery of the treatment is conventional and known to allow for conservation of treatment fluids and save process costs as "fresh", previously unused solution is unnecessary or greatly reduced for subsequent runs. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify the apparatus of Takashi et al as modified by Katsui et al with Konishi et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,507 Page 5

Art Unit: 1716

### Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sylvia R. MacArthur whose telephone number is 571-272-1438. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th during the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

, and the state of the state of

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571-272-1435. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 18, 2011

/Sylvia R MacArthur/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1716